



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,109	10/29/2003	Robert Wright	030305 (BLL-0114)	6914
36192	7590	01/23/2008	EXAMINER	
CANTOR COLBURN LLP - BELLSOUTH 20 Church Street 22nd Floor Hartford, CT 06103			PYO, MONICA M	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2161		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		01/23/2008	PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/696,109	WRIGHT ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Monica M. Pyo	2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 November 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All
  - b) Some \*
  - c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to the Amendment filed 11/1/2007.
2. Claims 1-21 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 16 and 21 are independent claims. In the Amendment filed 11/1/2007, claims 1, 16 and 21 are amended. This action is made Final.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
4. Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-13, 15-16 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over International Application Publication Number WO 02/054708 by Redmond (hereinafter Redmond) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,415,373 issued to Peters et al. (hereinafter Peters).

Regarding Claim 1, Redmond discloses that it is well known in the art that a method for providing delivery of a segmented data file comprising:

**A). receiving a request to send the segmented data file to a target device,** as requests are received from clients (Redmond: pg. 3, lns. 25-35; pg. 5, lns. 17-19; fig. 1);

**C). for at least one of the one or more segments,** as segmented data files (Redmond: pg. 6, lns. 4-11):

**D). determining, from the directory, one or more of the source locations containing a data bundle corresponding to the at least one of the one or more segment, as to determine the load and operational status of the various of nodes and servers (Redmond: pg. 6, lns. 20-34);**

**E). wherein the data bundle is retrievable from any of the determined source locations corresponding to the at least one of the one or more segments, as to deliver user requested content from determined segmented data file storages (Redmond: pg. 6, lns. 20-34; pg. 8, lns. 1-9); and**

**F). transmitting said data bundle from each said selected source location to said target device, as a display of requested media content (Redmond: pg. 7, lns. 1-13).**

Although Redmond discloses **the segmented data file, wherein at least one of the one or more segments included in the segmented data file corresponds to a plurality of source locations**, as segmented data files are stored in plurality of segment storages (Redmond: pg. 4, lns. 2-6; pg. 6, lns. 4-11), Redmond does not explicitly disclose the method to **query the directory and the directory lists one or more data files and the one or more segments that make up each data file, and the directory lists source locations containing data bundles that correspond to the at least one of the one or more segments; and selecting one of the source locations for the at least one of the one or more segments.**

However, Peters discloses:

**B). query the directory for one or more segments included in the segmented data file, wherein at least one of the one or more segments included in the segmented data file corresponds to a plurality of source locations, the directory lists one or more data files and**

**the one or more segments that make up each data file, and the directory lists source locations containing data bundles that correspond to the at least one of the one or more segments,** as an operating system searches the directory to find the location of the file and the data of a file or source is stored in segments (Peters: col. 13, lns. 9-65); and

**E). selecting one of the source locations for the at least one of the one or more segments,** as the operating system identifies space in the storage to make an entry for a new file (Peters: col. 13, lns. 9-39).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Redmond with the teachings of Peters to utilize the directory searching process with the motivation to enhance the computer system to capture, authoring and playback of multimedia programs and to distributed computing systems (Peters: col. 1, lns. 8-33).

Regarding Claim 2, Redmond and Peters disclose the method further comprising updating said directory with pointers to said target device for each said data bundle transmitted to said target device (Redmond: pg. 7, lns. 1-13) and (Peters: col. 13, lns. 24-39).

Regarding Claim 3, Redmond and Peters disclose the method wherein said request is from said target device (Redmond: pg. 3, lns. 29-35; pg. 5, lns. 14-23).

Regarding Claim 6, Redmond and Peters disclose the method further comprising: receiving a data file (Redmond: pg. 5, lns. 33-pg. 6, lns. 3);

segmenting said data file into data bundles (Redmond: pg. 5, lns. 14-23; pg. 8, lns. 10-18);

staging said data bundles to one or more said source locations (Redmond: pg. 8, lns. 1-9; pg. 13, lns. 10-13) and (Peters: col. 13, lns. 24-39); and

updating said directory to reflect said data bundles and said source locations for said data file as said segmented data file (Redmond: pg. 8, lns. 1-9) and (Peters: col. 19, lns. 36-49).

Regarding Claim 7, Redmond and Peters disclose the method wherein said selecting is responsive to a network topology (Peters: col. 5, lns. 57-col. 6, lns. 12).

Regarding Claim 8, Redmond and Peters disclose the method wherein said selecting is responsive to capabilities at said one or more source locations (Redmond: pg. 6, lns. 20-34) and (Peters: col. 6, lns. 26-60).

Regarding Claim 10, Redmond and Peters disclose the method wherein said segmented data file includes one or more of audio and video (Redmond: pg. 2, lns. 4-10) and (Peters: col. 8, lns. 20-28; fig. 3).

Regarding Claim 11, Redmond and Peters disclose the method wherein said target device is a personal computer (Redmond: pg. 5, lns. 14-23).

Regarding Claim 12, Redmond and Peters disclose the method wherein said target device includes a video server (Peters: col. 1, lns. 61-col. 2, lns. 5).

Regarding Claim 13, Redmond and Peters disclose the method wherein said target device includes an audio server (Peters: col. 1, lns. 61-col. 2, lns. 5).

Regarding Claim 15, Redmond and Peters disclose the method wherein said target device is any device capable of storing said segmented data file (Redmond: pg. 3, lns. 1-5) and (Peters: col. 7, lns. 36-58).

Regarding Claim 16, Redmond and Peters disclose all the limitations as recited in claim 1.

1. Additionally, Redmond and Peters disclose a system for providing delivery of a segmented data file comprising:

- A). **the segmented data file accessible via a network**, as resources being available in a network (Redmond: pg. 8, lns. 19-29);
- B). **a directory accessible via the network**, as various resources being accessible via a network (Peters: col. 13, lns. 9-65);
- C). **a target device in communication with the network**, as a delivering and serving media content via a distributed network (Redmond: pg. 3, lns. 9-19); and
- D). **a network element in communication with the network including instructions to implement a method including**, as the Neuro Center manages all requests for media content and is accessible via an internetwork (Redmond: pg. 5, lns. 14-33).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Redmond with the teachings of Peters to utilize the directory searching process with the motivation to enhance the computer system to capture, authoring and playback of multimedia programs and to distributed computing systems (Peters: col. 1, lns. 8-33).

Regarding Claim 18, Redmond and Peters disclose the system wherein said network includes the Internet (Redmond: pg. 24-32) and (Peters: col. 35-56).

Regarding Claim 19, Redmond and Peters disclose the system wherein said network includes a broadband network (Redmond: pg 5, lns. 24-32) and (Peters: col. 2, lns. 26-35; col. 4, lns. 18-31).

Regarding Claim 20, Redmond and Peters disclose the system wherein said network is any network capable of transmitting data from one location to another location (Peters: col. 13, lns. 9-65).

Regarding Claim 21, Redmond and Peters disclose all the limitations as recited in claim 1.

1. Additionally, Peters disclose a computer program product for providing delivery of segmented data files, the computer program product comprising:

**a storage medium readable by a processing circuit and storing instructions for execution by the processing circuit for performing a method comprising,** as the system (Peters: col. 6, lns. 13-24):

5. Claims 4 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Redmond in view of Peters applied to claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-13, 15-16 and 18-21 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,862,594 issued to Saulpaugh (hereafter Saulpaugh).

Regarding Claim 4, although Peters disclose the method of redistributing segmented files (fig. 8), Redmond and Peters do not explicitly disclose the method further comprising retransmitting said data bundle from one of said selected source locations in response to a transmission error.

However, Saulpaugh disclose the method further comprising retransmitting said data bundle from one of said selected source locations in response to a transmission error (Saulpaugh: col. 54, lns. 50-61).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Redmond and Peters with the teachings of Saulpaugh to utilize the retransmission of data when an error occurs with the motivation to enhance accessing a service in a distributed computing environment (Saulpaugh: col. 8, lns. 27-36).

Regarding Claim 17, Although Redmond discloses the system using a wireless device (pg. 5, lns. 17-19), Redmond and Peters do not explicitly disclose the system wherein said network includes a wireless network.

However, Saulpaugh the system wherein said network includes a wireless network (Saulpaugh: col. 15, lns. 33-42).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Redmond and Peters with the teachings of Saulpaugh to utilize the retransmission of data when an error occurs with the motivation to enhance accessing a service in a distributed computing environment (Saulpaugh: col. 8, lns. 27-36).

6. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Redmond in view of Peters as applied to claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-13, 15-16 and 18-21 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0236785 by Greiner (hereafter Greiner).

Regarding Claim 5, Redmond and Peters disclose the method further comprising said segmented data file from said data bundles (Redmond: pg. 8, lns. 10-18).

Redmond and Peters do not explicitly disclose: transmitting instructions for reassembling However, Greiner disclose transmitting instructions for reassembling (Greiner: [0042], lns. 4-7 & 11-16).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Redmond and Peters with the teachings of Greiner to utilize the transmitting the instruction to reassemble the data with the motivation to enhance the method

and system for uploading data from first device to second device over a communication network (Greiner: [0006], lns. 1-5).

7. Claims 9 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Redmond in view of Peters as applied to claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-13, 15-16 and 18-21 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,486,892 issued to Stern (hereafter Stern).

Regarding Claim 9, Redmond and Peters do not disclose the method wherein said segmented data file includes one or more of a software package, a software patch and a software upgrade.

However, Stern disclose the method wherein said data file includes one or more of a software package, a software patch and a software upgrade (Stern: col. 7, lns. 45-50).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Redmond and Peters with the teachings of Stern to utilize the method of receiving periodic updates of predetermined information with the motivation to enhance the periodic and automatic queries to sites containing information relevant to the user (Stern: col. 1, lns. 50-56).

Regarding Claim 14, Redmond and Welsh and Stern disclose wherein said target device is a hand held device with storage capability including one or more of a telephone, a personal digital assistant and an audio player (Welsh: col. 1, lns. 1-19) and (Stern: col. 7, lns. 61-67).

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Monica M. Pyo whose telephone number is 571-272-8192. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon & Thur 8:00 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Monica M Pyo  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2161

*mpyo*  
1/20/2008

*Etienne Leroux*  
ETIENNE LEROUX  
PRIMARY EXAMINER